

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 18, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1 and 9. Claims 1-9 are pending in this application.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner James Harvey for the courtesy of a telephone interview on May 11, 2006 with Applicant's representative Peter C. Maki. Claim 9 was discussed.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by Stathopoulos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,494,729).

Claim 1 has been amended to better describe the subject matter recited in the claim. Applicant believes claim 1 is not anticipated in view of the cited reference since the reference does not include each limitation recited in the claim. For instance, Applicant cannot find in the cited reference: a control lever having a L-shaped form which is rotatably connected to the gripper arm of the lever/pull handle, wherein the control lever includes a stepping pawl to operate the switch when the plug-in module is completely inserted. In contrast, the reference discusses a latch 30 which is generally a straight member. The end of latch 30 engages a switch and if the latch had an L-form, the latch would not function as intended.

Claims 2-4 and 6 include each limitation of their parent claim and are therefore also not anticipated by the cited reference. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Han et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,989,043).

Claim 1 has been amended to better describe the subject matter recited in the claim. Applicant believes claim 1 is not anticipated in view of the cited reference since the reference does not include each limitation recited in the claim. For instance, Applicant cannot find in the cited reference: a control lever having a L-shaped form which is rotatably connected to the

gripper arm of the lever/pull handle, wherein the control lever includes a stepping pawl to operate the switch when the plug-in module is completely inserted.

Claims 4 and 6 include each limitation of their parent claim and are therefore also not anticipated by the cited reference. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7 and 8 were allowed.

Claim 9 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten claim 9 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 359-3267 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.


Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL JOIST

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 359-3267

Date 8/17/06

By 
Peter C. Maki
Reg. No. 42,832

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 17th day of August 2006.

PATRICIA A. HULTMAN

Name


Signature